

**REMARKS**

Claims 11, 12, 13, and 19 have been rewritten.

**I. ALLOWABLE MATTER**

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 1-5, 7-9, 6, 7, 15, and 17 are allowed.

**II. OBJECTION**

The Office objected to dependant claim 19 for depending from cancelled claim 15 and as such required correction.

The Applicants apologize to the Office for any time and effort caused by this informality. The Applicants have currently requested amend of claim 19 to have it depend from independent claim 14 rather than cancelled dependant claim 15.

The Applicants also requested amendment of claims 11, 12, and 13 to reflect proper dependency from independent claim 10

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Office has rejected independent claim 10 as be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Gilford in view of Maslov (US 6,812,661 B2). In particular, the Office in setting forth its rejection of claim 10 held that Gilford discloses multiple wire coil sets with reciprocating magnetic objects that variably controls the time duration for the energizing of the individual coil wire sets but does not skip wire coils sets at selected times. The Office further sets forth that Maslov teaches that motors have different efficiencies based on the number of coils or wire turns in a coil and that it would be obvious

to vary the number of coils or turns in a coil to increase the efficiency of the device.

**May 25, 2005 Examiner's Teleconference**

The Applicants respectfully thank Examiner for the opportunity to speak with the Examiner on this issue. The Examiner and Applicants (through their patent counsel of record) came to the tentative agreement that the current invention substantially teaches the general interruption of a normal energizing cycle of a wire coil to generally allow the momentum of the moving magnetic object rather than the magnetic effect of an energized coil to move the magnetic object relative to the non-energized coil. The examiner tentatively agreed that the limitation of claim 10 was not taught by Gilford or Maslov (US 6,812,661 B2). The examiner tentatively found that Maslov in particular appears to generally teach the selective energizing of sections of wire constituting a wire coil during operations rather than the non-energizing of a wire coil during a period of invention operation when it would otherwise be energized. The examiner indicated, subject to review for other prior art that may teach this limitation, possible approval and allowance of claim 10 on its current language.

### CONCLUSION

With the above amendments and argument, the Applicants believe that they have fully responded to the Office's stated objections and rejections and submit that the present Application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Office, in consideration of the above amendments and arguments, rescind its objections and rejections to the present Application and place it in position for issuance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the Application or this Amendment B, the Examiner is encouraged to call the Applicants' attorney, John D. Long, at (775) 827-8767 PST to resolve any issues in a timely and efficient manner.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his time and effort in this matter.

Respectfully submitted by



Date: May 26, 2006

---

John D. Long, Reg. No. 38,952  
PATENT COUNSEL

Long & Chybik  
1575 Delucchi Lane  
Suite 115  
Reno, Nevada 89502 USA  
V 01 (775) 827-8767 (PST)  
F: 01 (775) 827-0363  
E: [renopatents@aol.com](mailto:renopatents@aol.com)